

REMARKS

Claims 13-27 are pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

It is understood that the finality has been withdrawn and this present response is to a non-final action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 13, 19-22 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Blackett et al. (U.S. Pat. Application No. 2004/0138786A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Although Blackett appears to include certain elements that are similar to the elements in the present invention, the arrangement of the elements and their functionality clearly differ. This difference is emphasized in amended Claim 13.

There is no suggestion in Blackett that the application-specific engine and the bus protocol-specific engine be decoupled from one another. In fact, Blackett appears to suggest the opposite, at least in Blackett at Paragraphs [0008], [0038], [0068], and [0069].

In short, Blackett is directed to a relatively conventional SCADA (supervisory control and data acquisition) system as is used in a power generation system where the control architecture and the communication module are combined together.

Blackett is opposite to the present invention of independent Claims 13, 21 and 25. In the present invention, the advantageous features of decoupling, as in

Paragraphs [0012], [0013] and [0014], is described, particularly where the application (business logic) is separate from the communication logic of the device. These features are lacking in Blackett.

Independent Claim 21 further differs from Blackett in that independent Claim 21 specifically calls for an application-specific engine that controls the configuration apparatus independently of the communications protocol. Claim 21 further includes a bus protocol-specific engine that exchanges application-specific data with the application-specific engine via a standardized interface that is common to a standardized interface of the configuration apparatus. At least the feature of independent communications protocol and the feature of the standardized common interface as emphasized above, are lacking in Blackett.

As to Claim 21, Paragraph [0014] of the present application demonstrates the advantages of the arrangement where the application-specific engine (“Application”) can be developed independently of the bus protocol.

As to independent Claim 25, the further features of independence and the advantage of a standardized interface are not suggestive anywhere in Blackett.

As to Claim 25, the further advantages recited at least in Paragraph [0017] of the present application demonstrate that the arrangement of the present invention can be used for a plurality of different bus protocols without the bus protocol-specific engine having to be replaced upon a change of the bus system used by a correspondingly-changed bus protocol-specific engine.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

A. Claims 14-18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackett et al. (U.S. Pat. Application No. 2004/0138786A1) as applied to Claim 13, in view of Jankins et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,272,400). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of these claims, which are dependent directly or indirectly on Claim 13, for reasons as given above with respect to Blackett. Jankins does not supply the deficiencies of Blackett.

B. Claims 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackett et al. as applied to Claim 21, in view of obviousness. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of these claims, which are dependent directly or indirectly on Claim 21, for reasons as given above with respect to Blackett.

C. Claim 26 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blackett et al. as applied to Claim 25, in view of Jankins et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of this claim, which is dependent directly on Claim 25, for reasons as given above with respect to Blackett. Jankins does not supply the deficiencies of Blackett.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly

traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7 January 05

By: L.M.D.
Linda M. Deschere
Reg. No. 34,811

Ryan P. McCarthy
Reg. No. 50,636

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

LDES/cr/lf-s

G:\l\descher\7395 (Manitz, Finsterwald & Partner)\000003\OA due 01-19-05\Response.doc